



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,140	08/25/2003	Richard Harvey	063170.6611	3247
5073	7590	06/26/2007	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			LEWIS, ALICIA M	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2164		
		NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		06/26/2007		ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mike.furr@bakerbotts.com
ptomaill@bakerbotts.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/648,140	HARVEY ET AL.
	Examiner Alicia M. Lewis	Art Unit 2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2007.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to the communication filed April 20, 2007. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Claims 1-17 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan et al. (US Patent 6,834,286 B2) ('Srinivasan') in view of Gadbois et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0002955 A1) ('Gadbois').

With respect to claims 1 and 7, Srinivasan teaches:

providing a directory (Figure 1, abstract, column 4 lines 34-37) having object classes and attributes (Figure 1, column 1 lines 54 – column 2 line 13); defining attributes of a specific type which correspond to a specific object class (Figures 1 and 4, column 2 lines 1-50, column 5 lines 37-65); and generating an index based on the specific attribute types (Figures 4 and 6A-E, column 9 lines 1-21).

Srinivasan does not explicitly teach that the directory is used for providing web services.

Gadbois teaches information model mapping with shared directory tree representation (see abstract), in which he teaches a web services directory (paragraph 5 lines 14-25 and paragraph 24).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Srinivasan by the teaching of Gadbois because a web services directory would enable a registry service to help support the storage and retrieval of data and enable authentication, which would provide secure access to Internet services and applications (Gadbois, paragraphs 24 and 25). The modification would also enable an improved method and system for storing and maintaining object-oriented data in an RDBMS, more particularly for storing and maintaining directory information objects, such as LDAP data, in an RDBMS (Srinivasan, column 4 lines 25-31).

With respect to claims 2, 8 and 14, Srinivasan as modified teaches wherein the object classes are a subclass of an abstract object class (Srinivasan, column 14 lines 18-36).

With respect to claims 3, 9 and 15, Srinivasan as modified teaches wherein the specific object class relates to at least one of keyed references, names and classes (Srinivasan, Figure 1; Gadbois, paragraph 38, paragraph 64).

With respect to claims 4, 10 and 16, Srinivasan as modified teaches wherein the object class is an auxiliary object class (Srinivasan, column 15 lines 15-21).

With respect to claims 5, 11 and 17, Srinivasan as modified teaches wherein the auxiliary object class is a Publisher Assertion Keyed Reference (Gadbois, paragraphs 38-39, paragraph 47, paragraph 64).

With respect to claims 6 and 12, Srinivasan as modified teaches further comprising providing specific attributes which relate to one object class for a purpose of enhancing searching (Srinivasan, column 9 lines 1-11).

With respect to claim 13, Srinivasan as modified teaches:
providing a web services directory (Gadbois, paragraph 24; Srinivasan, Figure 1, abstract, column 4 lines 34-37) having a plurality of object classes, the plurality of object classes having a plurality of attributes (Srinivasan, Figure 1, column 1 lines 54 – column 2 line 13); and
defining a plurality of unique names for each of the plurality of attributes, each of the plurality of unique names corresponding to a respective one of the plurality of object classes (Srinivasan, Figures 1 and 4, column 2 lines 1-50, column 5 lines 37-65); and
generating an index based on the plurality of unique names (Srinivasan, Figures 4 and 6A-E, column 9 lines 1-21).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed April 20, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that neither Srinivasan nor Gadbois alone or in combination, teach defining attributes of a specific type which correspond to a specific object class because Srinivasan teaches that both the "Department" object class and the "Person" object class include the same attribute type "State". Examiner disagrees. Claims 1 and 7 require attributes types that correspond to specific object classes. The claims DO NOT specify that attribute types must correspond to ONLY one object class. Instead, it only requires that attributes of a specific type correspond to at least one object class. The attribute types "Department Name" and "Telephone Number" both correspond to specific object classes, i.e. "Department" and "Person", respectively. Therefore, Srinivasan teaches defining attributes of a specific type, which correspond to a specific object class.

4. Applicant further argues that Srinivasan does not teach generating an index based on the specific attribute types. Examiner disagrees. Srinivasan teaches, in column 9 lines 1-21, that specific attribute types are indexed (lines 5-7). He also shows the indexing in Figures 4 and 6A-E.

5. Lastly, applicant argues that Srinivasan nor Gadbois teaches defining a plurality of unique names for each of the plurality of attributes, each of the plurality of unique names corresponding to a respective one of the plurality of object classes. Examiner disagrees. Again, this claim limitation only requires that each attribute correspond to at

least one object class. It does not require each attribute to correspond to a different object class.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia M. Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-5599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 - 6:30, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alicia Lewis
June 12, 2007



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER